UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/591,919	09/06/2006	Hirokazu Taniguchi	52433/860	5382
26646 KENYON & K	7590 12/01/201 ENYON LLP	EXAMINER		
ONE BROADV	VAY	LEE, REBECCA Y		
NEW YORK, N	N1 10004		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1734	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/01/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/591,919	TANIGUCHI ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
REBECCA LEE	1734		

	REBECCA LEE	1734	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>12 November 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS	APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.	
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apper for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	which places the r (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires <u>5</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Arno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth hter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection	on.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in complifiling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. X The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	out prior to the date of filing a brief	will not be entered be	icalise
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	nsideration and/or search (see NOT		cause
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett	er form for appeal by materially red	ducing or simplifying tl	ne issues for
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally reje	octed claims	
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1 <sup>-1</sup>		cted claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	,	mpliant Amendment (	PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		(1)	
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		l be entered and an e	kplanation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>4 and 6-10</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>1-3</u> .			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	before or on the data of filing a Nic	ation of Annual will not	be entered
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	ıl and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER  11. ☑ The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/Frank. NA La /			
/Emily M Le/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1734	/R. L./		
Supervisory Faterit Examiner, Art Offic 1734	Examiner, Art Unit 1734		

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The amended features change the scope of finally rejected claims, and require further search and consideration.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues that JP'040 teach an additional quenching step in the middle of cooling after heating and soaking, compared to instant invention. However, instant claims as written do not exclude any additional steps, thus, the process of JP,040 reads on instant claims.

Applicant also argues the heating patterns disclosed by JP'152 are different from JP'040 and claimed. However, the heating pattern of instant invention is covered by JP'040; examiner only relies on JP'152 to show that incorporating a tempering step, as taught by JP'152 into the process of JP'040 would improve the tensile strength of the steel sheet by obtaining tempered martensite structure. Since applicant has not provided any factual evidence to show that incorporating the tempering step of JP'152 would have upset the process of JP'040, applicant's argument is not found persuasive.

Applicant also argues that US'426 and JP'537 do not teach the claimed process. However, as stated in the previous action, examiner only relies on US'426 and JP'537 to show that incorporating the resin coating of US'426 and the preplating step of JP'537 would reform the shape or adjust surface-roughness of the steel sheet and achieve good plating nature (plating wetability, alloying treatment nature). Since applicant has not provided any factual evidence to show that incorporating the resin coating of US'426 and the preplating step of JP'537 would have upset the process of JP'040 in view of JP'152, applicant's arguments are not found persuasive.